UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,843	01/30/2004	Nicolas Drevon	Q79623	4578
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 08/06/201 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	RUTKOWSKI, JEFFREY M		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTOI	N, DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2473	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/766,843	DREVON ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JEFEREY M. RUTKOWSKI	2473	

	JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI	2473	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) ☑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.124. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		maliant Amandment (	DTOL 224)
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		npliant Amendment (	- TOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) thou the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to: 15 and 17-19.  Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6-8,10-14 and 20-36.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	de e NOT de e de e endication in		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but The arguments with respect to Soldani not disclosing parand node B are not persuasive. The Applicant is arguing claim 1 refers to "said at least one parameter for transpobasis for the "said at least one parameter" feature. Howe the Examiner has interpreted the feature to mean that are between the pade B and the BNC.	rameters associated with the QoS on the properties of the properties of the parameters associated with the QoS on the parameters of the parameters as a social parameters of the parameters of t	of an lub interface bet he claims. For examp claim 1 provides the eters to the lub interfa	ween a RNC ble, line 10 of antecedent ace. Therefore,
between the node B and the RNC.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
13. Other:	/·		

**Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)** 

/KWANG B. YAO/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2473

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20100802

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Further search and/or consideration is required because claims 27-34 have been broadened by excluding the means for using. Also, claim 23 no longer requires a signaling means. The issue of new matter is raised because the terms "controller" and "data signaler" are generic structural terms that, standing alone, is synonomous with means and connotes no more structure than "means" to avoid means-plus-function status. Massachusetts Institute of Technology v. Abacus Software, 80 USPQ2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2006).